

REMARKS

Claims 16-35 are presently pending in the application, of which Claims 16 and 21 have been rejected by the Examiner. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's analysis of the prior art and, therefore, traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Examiner has applied U.S. Patent No. 5,558,403 to Hammoud et al as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102 for rejecting Claims 16 and 21. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's position because in order for the Hammoud et al. reference to qualify as the §102 prior art, it must include each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Hammoud et al. does not because the claimed relationship of the support member, arm, shaft, blocking pin and gear is not disclosed. For example, the Hammoud et al. reference does not disclose a shaft rotatably supported within a first slot of a support member and having a gear fixedly attached thereto and interacting with gear teeth of an arm pivotally supported by the support member, wherein the arm mounts the seat back and includes the plurality of gear teeth formed thereon. Further, Hammoud et al does not disclose any sort of gear attached to the shaft and interacting with gear teeth of an arm pivotally supported by a support member, wherein the arm mounts a seat back and includes a plurality of gear teeth formed thereon.

Because Hammoud et al. does not disclose each and every element of Applicant's claimed invention, rejection of Claims 16 and 21 is improper. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Notice of Allowable Subject Matter. With respect to Claims 17-20 and 22-28, which were objected to as being dependent upon a

rejected base claim, Applicant has decided not to amend these claims at this time in light of the arguments with respect to rejected Claims 16 and 21.

With respect to the drawings, the Examiner has objected to the drawings on the basis that reference sign 80 is not mentioned in the description. However, on Page 9, Line 2, of the application as filed, the reference number 80 is described to indicate a recess in the first lever arm 60. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

The Examiner has also objected to the drawings because, "reference character "pin slot" has been used to designate both 35 and 36." Applicant assumes the Examiner is referring to the fact that Figures 4 and 5 include reference to the aligned slots 34 and 35 (not 35 and 36) using a single lead line with the reference number 34, 35. The Examiner relies on 37 CFR 1.85(p)(4) as the basis for his objection, but that rule does not prohibit using a single lead line to designate aligned parts. In fact, Applicant has done this repeatedly in Figures 4 and 5. It is the Applicant's position that the drawings are not confusing and that when read in light of the specification, it is clear that the reference line points to the aligned pin slots 34, 35. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the drawing objection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 12, 2002

By: 

Michael Malinzak
Reg. No. 43,770

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MM:ca

Serial No. 09/755,515

Received from < 248 641 0270 > at 4/8/03 10:43:01 AM [Eastern Daylight Time]

BEST AVAILABLE COPY Page 4